

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1187

Ranchers, feeders, farmers, bankers, businessmen and State and Federal officials formed a gathering which the Iowa Highway Patrol estimated at between 5,000 and 6,000 persons—enough almost to double the population of Shenandoah. The overflow of an auditorium which seated fewer than 1,000 clustered at other points to listen through a public-address system to a long list of speakers.

At the conclusion they sent to Congress a plea which can be boiled down to: "Roll back the imports of beef which are crushing the American cattle industry."

The resolution which these mid-Americans sent to Washington is a terse, reasoned document.

It calls upon Congress "to limit, by legislative action, imports of beef and veal, fresh, frozen, cooked, and/or canned or cured, to levels in pounds approximately equal in volume to the levels of 1960, approximately 775 million pounds, or 4.9 percent of domestic production that year."

And it takes note of the consequences of some domestic overproduction which the imports have aggravated by calling upon the cattle industry to "take effective action toward orderly marketing and production, as well as production more nearly commensurate with consumer demands."

Observe that the men who met at Shenandoah did not demand that Congress shut off all beef imports. They are willing to concede a reasonable share of the American market to foreign producers, but they want it set at a figure they can live with. They want it stabilized, so that it won't again grow into a flood.

Here and there a voice pops up to blame the cattle industry's troubles solely on the industry. "Overproduction," they say. "Too many cattle here at home."

The analysis is valid—to a point. But this problem has been faced and disposed of by the cattle industry, without outside help, since the days of the Chisholm Trail.

But, as Cecil W. Means, vice president of the Stockyards National Bank, told the meeting in Shenandoah, the rapidly rising tide of imported beef has confronted the cattle industry with "an added imponderable it has never had to face before—an unanswerable question."

"We do not know to what extent or how fast meat imports are going to grow."

The voice from the Midlands now is telling Congress in effect:

Put a reasonable limit on imports, and we'll take care of the rest of our problem.

This is wise counsel which the Congress will heed if it wants to save the cattle industry and all of the economic life of America which is dependent upon it.

The Real Culprits in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 6, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished news columnist Mr. David Lawrence has written another outstanding column analyzing the real difficulties we face in South Vietnam. This column, as printed in the Evening Star of March 5, 1964, is entitled "The Real Culprits in Vietnam: U.S. Viewed as Falling To Face Up to Aggressions of Peiping, Moscow."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE REAL CULPRITS IN VIETNAM: UNITED STATES VIEWED AS FAILING TO FACE UP TO AGGRESSIONS OF PEIPING, MOSCOW

(By David Lawrence)

The cold war is getting hotter, but the United States is not facing up to the real enemy. A lot of talk is heard about intensifying America's military action in South Vietnam, but not a word of denunciation is being uttered by the Government here about the acts of aggression being committed in southeast Asia and other parts of the world by the Communist regimes in Peiping and Moscow.

The American people are disturbed about the South Vietnam situation. Many Members of Congress are debating it, and the controversy will doubtless become a campaign issue. It is being suggested on Capitol Hill that the United States ought to pursue the war to a finish or get out of southeast Asia.

What generally seems to be overlooked in Washington, however, is that the real culprits are the Soviet Union and Red China. There probably would be no war between North and South Vietnam today if the Communists were not supplying the arms and munitions and the technical advisers trained in guerrilla warfare. The fact that the North Vietnamese are supposed to be irregulars and guerrillas seems to be accepted as an excuse for avoiding the real issue—the placing of responsibility on the governments which are financing, training, and supporting the guerrillas.

The phrase cold war nowadays is, for the most part, supposed to imply the use of subversion and infiltration rather than military action. Yet in various parts of the globe the Communists are actually behind the military movements. The fact that the Soviet Union became involved in establishing missile bases on Cuban soil led to what has been described as a real crisis in Latin-American affairs. But even though the missiles have been withdrawn, there has been no letup in the Soviet Union's military support, and there is official confirmation of the fact that Cuban troops are being trained by Russian technicians. A recent report by the Organization of American States shows clearly an attempt by the Soviet Government to use Castro's apparatus as a means of overthrowing the Government of Venezuela.

Whether it is in Latin America or in Africa or in southeast Asia, or even in Cyprus, the handiwork of the Communists is visible to the naked eye. But the Western governments seem too much inclined to ignore the center of responsibility for these troubles and to prefer to consider them as local.

What complicates the situation is the bungling of foreign policy in the United States, Great Britain, and France. There is a failure to come to grips with the basic problem—whether the Soviet Union and the Red China regimes are going to be permitted to continue their acts of aggression against the free world, their interference with the operations of independent governments, and threats to the peace of the world. It is often suggested that the matter be taken before the United Nations, but this organization now is under the control of the Communist bloc.

Nevertheless, the sentiment here in Washington is that the United States should make its fight in the court of public opinion throughout the world. The feeling is growing that, even though a blunder has been made in the sale of American wheat to the

Soviet Government—an action which precipitated an increase in British, French, and Spanish trade with Cuba—it is up to the United States to use every resource at its command, including economic power, to draw a line between the free world and the slave world.

There are supposed to be approximately 15,000 American troops in South Vietnam. Already, American casualties number nearly 200 dead, and many more have been wounded. Congress has not authorized the Armed Forces of the United States to go to southeast Asia, as is customary when a military action is pursued. The reason given is that American troops are in South Vietnam at the request of the government there. But while this has accounted for the utilization of American military forces in some instances in the past, there usually has been a movement to get an authorization from Congress, as the Constitution requires.

Economic pressure can be employed as a powerful alternative to military action. The big decision that will have to be made by countries like Great Britain and France is whether the pursuit of material gain is more important than the use of an economic boycott to stop the buildup of Communist strength in various parts of the world.

Unless action is taken to fix the blame publicly and to arouse world opinion, the United States will sooner or later find itself forced in to a shooting war. This can be avoided by taking firm and resolute steps now to mobilize world opinion against the two governments—the Soviets and Red Chinese—which are responsible for the many local wars throughout the globe.

Chandler, Henderson County, Tex., Takes on New Drive With Municipal Water Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 6, 1964

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the hometown in which I grew to manhood in Henderson County, Tex., the town of Chandler, is not a new town. A post office was established there, called Stillwater in the early 1870's, but the name was changed to Chandler with the coming of the railroad in 1880. By the 1960 census its population was 715. Since the depression of the 1930's and the mechanization of agriculture, its growth has been very slow.

Now, with a matching area redevelopment grant, a municipal water system is being built at Chandler. The town is growing; business houses are being built, but more important, homes are being built. This pickup has been noticeable enough that the Athens Weekly Review, which under the driving editorship of Dick Dwelle has become one of the fast growing county seat newspapers in Texas, in its February 13, 1964, edition carried the lead editorial commending Chandler for its rejuvenation, its spirit and its growth, under the title "Chandler's New Spirit."

As a tribute to the people of my hometown, I ask unanimous consent that the

A1188

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- APPENDIX

March 6

editorial from the Athens Weekly Review of February 13, 1964, under the title "Chandler's New Spirit" be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANDLER'S NEW SPIRIT

When progress begins to take shape in a community, there are few that are left in the wake. Most are absorbed by the tide and simply add to the force that is working for progress.

Chandler has enjoyed the addition of a number of lovely homes through the years. Yet, there seemed to be little real townwide spirit.

Things are changing, however. Perhaps it had its beginning when the people decided they wanted a waterworks. Of course, one progressive move does not make a community of action, but there has to be a starting place and that may have been it.

Last week we read in the Review, and proudly so, that the people of Chandler had come through with flying colors in the United Fund campaign. The total was \$529.70, by far the largest sum that Chandler has ever contributed to the fund.

One successful fund drive, just like one progressive community action, does not determine what a community is or will be. But when the people in a community are doing something for themselves and then raise money to do for others, it demonstrates that their interests in doing are aroused.

We are happy to see it and we know that the people of Chandler must be pleased to see their town on the move.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives an essay written by Miss Joan Tonn, of Morris, Minn. This essay was prepared in conjunction with the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy contest. Each year the VFW asks our young people to reflect and express themselves on the fundamental aspects of our democratic processes. That they do reflect and can express themselves is admirably demonstrated by Joan Tonn. "The Challenge of Citizenship," written by Miss Tonn, was awarded first place in the State of Minnesota. I am proud to count her among my constituents. I recommend her article to you:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

Freedom is a personal thing. Recognition of this is essential if we, as citizens of one of the greatest countries this world has ever known, are to accept this challenge of citizenship.

I'm certain that you have all heard the phrase, "Well, I know something should be done, but what can I do?" If you listened carefully, you realized that this statement

actually questioned the ability of the individual to accomplish anything. This passive attitude, which has become characteristic of many Americans, is one which should greatly concern us all.

What is the basic cause of this passive attitude? I believe that it is essentially a lack of knowledge. This challenge of citizenship is especially great for that individual who wants to participate, at least in a small, intelligent way, in the control of his nation's fate; but, who holds back his opinions because he feels he has not the training or influence to speak effectively.

This condition was dramatically demonstrated at the time of the assassination of our late President, John F. Kennedy. Suddenly, the knowledge of every facet of the Office of the Presidency became extremely important. Many of us wondered who followed the Vice President in the line of succession, if any certain man would assume the duties of Vice President, the procedure of selecting Cabinet members, and many other questions.

Naturally, those seemed small considerations in the wake of such a great tragedy. However, we soon realized that many of the principles of our Government which we had taken for granted for so long, were now assuring the continuity of that same government.

However, a simple acceptance of that fact is not enough—for those principles were not born of themselves. They were established by citizens of the United States—citizens with enough foresight and confidence in the future of their nation to provide for its safety.

How are such principles established? There are two prerequisites for such action—interest and knowledge. Because we live in a democracy it is extremely unlikely that an individual would completely lack an interest in his government. Thus, the stumbling block is usually a lack of knowledge. Americans have many methods of participation in government, such as initiative, referendum, and recall. However, the most basic form is still the right to vote. It is a privilege which is sorely abused by many Americans, either through misuse or by failing to vote at all. Much has been said of the subject of the responsibility of voting, but it seems that it has accomplished very little. The same people continue to vote for the candidate, party, or issues for which their husbands, wives, or fathers voted. They give little or no regard to the competence of the individual; nor do they take the time to really inform themselves on both sides or even one side of the issue at hand.

The average man or woman can have a powerful effect on the national scene once the realization strikes home that no voice goes unnoticed, particularly if it is raised in an intelligent question, objection, or praise. The unorganized civilian is potentially the greatest force of all. There is a politician's maxim that election victories are scored by those who realize that votes are counted one by one. So then, the only thing holding us back from achieving our highest aspirations is ourselves. We must never underestimate one another for an inspiring example can achieve marvelous things. With interest and knowledge we can make our own destiny.

The challenge of citizenship, then, is recognizing the fact that freedom is, indeed, a personal thing. And with that acceptance, we should join with the anonymous author who wrote: "I am only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. What I can do, I ought to do. And what I ought to do, by God's grace I will do."

JOAN C. TONN.

International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 6, 1964

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Mr. John C. Lynn, legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation in opposition to H.R. 8864, International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963.

This letter was offered for inclusion in the record of the hearings of the Senate Finance Committee on this legislation, but the hearings had already been printed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION.

Washington, D.C., March 2, 1964.

Re H.R. 8864, International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The American Farm Bureau Federation, comprising a membership of 1,628,295 farm and ranch families located in some 2,700 counties of 49 States and Puerto Rico, is opposed to the enactment of this legislation. We opposed the ratification of the coffee agreement last year.

We believe that the administration was unwise in negotiating the agreement as was the Senate in ratifying it. We are opposed to commodity agreements or arrangements in principle because, by their very nature, they are trade restrictive rather than expansive, and in every case so far, have redounded to the disadvantage of the United States.

We stated in our letter of March 12, 1963, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that international commodity agreements usually allocate markets on the basis of some historical performance which penalizes efficient producers and hoists an umbrella of protection for the inefficient. Expansion of trade and consumption or use is retarded and may be decreased in the interest of maintaining a certain level of prices.

We have witnessed just such a result with the current coffee agreement. Supplies have been held off the market through export quotas, and prices have skyrocketed. American consumers have borne an additional cost of \$350 million per year.

Since the agreement came into force, coffee prices have risen nearly 80 percent and are still rising. Our Government tried in a feeble manner to get the export quotas expanded and, after months of talking obtained a 5-percent increase. This small increase has been ineffective in slowing the advance in prices. As a consequence of this advance in prices, coffee consumption in the United States has declined and probably will continue to decline as prices advance further.

It should be borne in mind that the rise in coffee prices is not necessarily reflected back to the coffee farmer. In most countries the farm price of coffee is supported by government at an incentive level and, except for occasional weather reductions, production is rising in all of the important producing countries. Thus, the chief beneficiaries of